UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

FILE	
OCT)
2017	

For the reason stated by the parties on the record on Nov. 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speed Trial Act from (15, 2017, 2017, to Nov. 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors: Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I). The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. TI IS SO ORDERED. DATED: United States Magistrate Judge		UAK	LAND DIV	131014		NODCLESUSE 2017
TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT Time Under the Speed of the reason stated by the parties on the record on the record on the reason stated by the parties on the record on the record on the reason stated by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors: Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I). The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. TI IS SO ORDERED. DATED: United States Magistrate Judge	United States of America,)	Case No.	17-CR-	499	PJH ONSTRUCTIONS
For the reason stated by the parties on the record on Nov. 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speed Trial Act from (15, 2017, 2017, to Nov. 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors: Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I). The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. TI IS SO ORDERED. DATED: United States Magistrate Judge	Plaintiff,)				
continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:	Omar A. Guyman, Defendant.)))				
See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(I). The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	continuance outweigh the best interest of the	e public	and the de	fendant in a sp	beedy trial.	See 18 U.S.C. §
defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	Failure to grant a continuan See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)	ice wou (B)(I).	ld be likely	to result in a	miscarriag	e of justice.
taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	defendants, the nature of the or law, that it is unreasonab	e prosecule to ex	cution, or the pect adequate	ne existence of ate preparation	f novel que n for pretri	estions of fact al proceedings or the trial
given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge						
necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	given counsel's other schedule	ed case	commitme			
3161(b) and waived with the consent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 5.1(c) and (d). For the reasons stated on the record, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	necessary for effective prep	aration,				
3161(h)(1)(E)(F) for delay resulting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	3161(b) and waived with the					
DATED: Donna M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge						
DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	IT IS SO ORDERED.					
DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge	- Databer 1th			100		
United States Magistrate Judge	DATED:		DO	NINIA NE DA		
0.11	0/					ıdge
	STIPULATED:		S	DAD	LXS	Z

Attorney for Defendant

Assistant United States Attorney